

**REMARKS**

In the present Amendment, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the ink is an inkjet ink. This amendment is supported, for example, at page 1, first paragraph of the specification. Claim 7 has been amended to positively recite a method step. Section 112 support for this amendment may be found, for example, at pages 220 to 221 of the specification. New claim 8 has been added. Section 112 support for claim 8 may be found, for example, at pages 11 to 14 of the specification. No new matter has been added, and entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 1-8 will be pending.

The Examiner has attached to the Action an initialed copy of the Form PTO/SB/08 filed with Applicants' Disclosure Statement of June 25, 2004.

**The Examiner appears to have overlooked to place her initials next to the first two listed documents. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to provide another copy of the Form PTO/SB/08 on which the first two documents have been initialed.**

In Paragraph No. 3 of the Action, claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

As noted above, claim 7 has been amended to positively recite a method step. Accordingly, the indefiniteness rejection should be overcome.

In Paragraph No. 5 of the Action, claim 1 is provisionally rejected for obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-4 and 14 of co-pending Application No. 10/611,990 (US 2004/0055508).

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/808,460

Applicants submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer to obviate this rejection.

In Paragraph No. 7 of the Action, claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by EP 1384762.

EP '762 was published on January 28, 2004, which is later in time than Applicants' first priority date of March 25, 2003. To perfect their claim to priority and to remove EP '762 as a reference, Applicants submit herewith a sworn English translation of their first priority document, JP 2003-082852. Section 112 support for the present claims in the priority document is as shown in the following chart:

Present Claim	Support in Priority Document
Claim 1	Claim 1
Claim 2	Claim 2
Claim 3	Claim 3
Claim 4	Claim4
Claim 5	Claim 5
Claim 6	Claim 6
Claim 7	Page 89, line 24 et seq., and the working Examples
Claim 8	Second paragraph at page 5 to first paragraph at page 7

In view of the above, withdrawal of the § 102(a) rejection based on EP '762 is respectfully requested.

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/808,460

In Paragraph No. 8 of the Action, claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Miyamoto et al (US 2004/0055508).


Miyamoto et al '508 has a § 102(e) date of July 3, 2003, which is later in time than Applicants' first priority date of March 25, 2003. To perfect their claim to priority and to remove Miyamoto et al '508 as a reference, Applicants submit herewith a sworn English translation of their first priority document, JP 2003-082852. Section 112 support for the present claims in the priority document is as shown in above chart.

Accordingly, withdrawal of § 102(e) rejection based on Miyamoto et al '508 is respectfully requested.

Allowance is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Brett S. Sylvester  
Registration No. 32,765

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
23373  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 26, 2006